

REMARKS

In this response to the above-identified Office Action, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks. Claims 15 and 16 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 2, 7, and 17 have been amended. No claims have been added or cancelled. Accordingly, Claims 1-14 and 17-23 are pending in the application.

Interview Summary

Applicant greatly appreciates Examiner's time in discussion via telephone conference on November 6, 2008. Examiner and Attorney for the Applicant discussed the amendments made to independent Claims 1, 2, 7, and 17 submitted previously in the response of Sept. 19, 2008. Examiner indicated that the amendments to Claims 7 and 17 in the response would be sufficient to overcome the currently cited references. Examiner suggested that Claims 1 and 2 be amended to clarify that a single image manipulator may receive image sensor orientation, receive display orientation, and adjust the image orientation. Applicant has accordingly amended Claims 1 and 2 in this supplemental response.

In addition, Examiner requested that claim language including "configured to" and "adapted to" be amended to remove such wording. Amendments to Claims 1, 2, 7, and 17 are accordingly submitted herein.

Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the Examiner must show that the cited references, combined, teach or suggest each of the elements of a claim. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Further, the combination of elements must be more than the predictable use of prior art elements according to their established functions. See *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. ___, 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007).

Claims 1-9, 13(1), 13(2), and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,781,623 issued to Thomas (hereinafter “Thomas”) in view of US 7,289,102 issued to Hinckley (hereinafter “Hinckley”). Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons.

Claims 1 and 2, as amended, include “an image manipulator, wherein one of the sensing device and the display device includes the image manipulator” (emphasis added). Examiner has not relied upon and Applicant has not been able to discern any part of Thomas or Hinckley that teaches or suggests the above limitations. Thus, Examiner has indicated via telephone on November 6, 2008 that Thomas in view of Hinckley does not teach or suggest each of the elements of the claims as amended herein. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of these claims are requested.

In addition, as discussed above, Examiner has indicated that Thomas in view of Hinckley does not teach or suggest each of the elements of independent **Claim 7**, as previously amended. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of this claim are requested.

Claims 3-9, 13(1), 13(2), and 14 depend from independent Claims 1, 2, and 7, respectively, and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to the independent claims, Thomas in view of Hinckley does not teach or suggest each of the elements of these claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of these claims are requested.

Claims 17, 19, 20, 22, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hinckley in view of Thomas. Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons.

As discussed above, Examiner has indicated that Hinckley in view of Thomas does not teach or suggest each of the elements of independent **Claim 17**, as previously amended. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of this claim are requested.

Claims 19, 20, 22, and 23 depend from independent Claim 17 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to the independent claim, Hinckley in view of Thomas does not teach or suggest each of the elements of these claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of these claims are requested.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Thomas in view of Hinckley and U.S. Patent No. 6,597,384 issued to Harrison (hereinafter “Harrison”). Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons.

Claim 10 depends from independent Claim 7 and incorporates the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to the independent claim, and because Examiner has not relied upon and Applicant has not been able to discern any part of Harrison that cures the deficiencies of Thomas and Hinckley, Thomas in view of Hinckley and Harrison does not teach or suggest each of the elements of this claim. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of this claim are requested.

Claims 11(1), 11(2), and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Thomas in view of Hinckley, U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2005/0007477 by Ahisha (hereinafter “Ahisha”), and U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/013093 by Riconda (hereinafter “Riconda”). Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons.

Claims 11(1), 11(2), and 12 depend from independent Claims 1, 2, and 7, respectively, and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to the independent claims, and because Examiner has not relied upon and Applicant has not been able to discern any part of Ahisha or Riconda that cures the deficiencies of Thomas and Hinckley, Thomas in view of Hinckley, Ahisha, and Riconda does not teach or suggest each of the elements of these claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of these claims are requested.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hinckley in view of Thomas and Harrison. Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons.

Claim 18 depends from independent Claim 17 and incorporates the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to the independent claim, and because Examiner has not relied upon and Applicant has not been able to discern any part of Harrison that cures the deficiencies of Hinckley and Thomas, Hinckley in view of Thomas and Harrison does not teach or suggest each of the elements of this claim. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of this claim are requested.

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hinckley in view of Thomas, Ahisha, and Riconda. Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons.

Claim 21 depends from independent Claim 17 and incorporates the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to the independent claim, and because Examiner has not relied upon and Applicant has not been able to discern any part of Ahisha or Riconda that cures the deficiencies of Hinckley and Thomas, Hinckley in view of Thomas, Ahisha, and Riconda does not teach or suggest each of the elements of this claim. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of this claim are requested.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application; the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees to process this Amendment, or credit any over-payments that may apply, to our Deposit Account No. 50-2421.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 6, 2008

/David R. Stevens/
David R. Stevens
Reg. No. 38,626

Stevens Law Group
1754 Technology Dr., Ste. 226
San Jose, CA 95110
Tel (408) 288-7588
Fax (408) 288-7542